

and their patriotism to doubt that they can reach a compromise which will fully meet the situation and give an immediate ratification of the treaty by an overwhelming majority and thus enable us to turn our attention to the pressing demands of domestic issues. The party which, by insisting upon unreasonable demands, makes the treaty a vital issue in next year's campaign will invite the wrath of the voters.

W. J. BRYAN.

DEPLORES SENATE'S ACTION

(From The Hot Springs, Ark., Sentinel-Record.)

Deploping the action of the United States senate in refusing to ratify the peace treaty, Col. William Jennings Bryan issued a statement that contained a potent warning to that august body and reflected, as it were, the sentiment of the nation, when he called attention to the present spirit of unrest, the fact that "the plutocrat and the profiteer are abroad in the land," and that the American people were in no mood for delays that added to the present discontent. Colonel Bryan is deeply interested in the Peace Treaty. He is a staunch supporter of the League of Nations.

STATEMENT OF MR. BRYAN ON SENATE'S ACTION ON THE PEACE TREATY

(From the Hot Springs, Ark., New Era, Nov. 20.)

"Deplorable," was the term used by William Jennings Bryan in describing the senate's action in failing to ratify the peace treaty, when the Great Commoner was interviewed here today relative to that subject. Col. Bryan added however that it was in his belief that the senate would agree on some compromise when the regular session of congress convenes in the near future. He said that President Wilson had been forced to fight a single handed battle in Paris against nations seeking advantages and that a perfect treaty could not be expected as the outcome.

Col. Bryan called attention to the fact that more than three-fourths of the senate were in favor of the treaty and the League of Nations and that it was merely on details that they differed. As no decision can be reached without a two-thirds majority, the differing factions must come together by a compromise. Col. Bryan said that if this was not done there must be an indefinite delay which the people cannot stand for.

Such domestic affairs as the differences between labor and capital and the encroachments of the profiteer must be attended to or else these evils will gain a strangle hold upon the people while congress is wrangling with the peace treaty.

Col. Bryan's statement was as follows:

"The adjournment of the senate without ratifying the treaty is greatly to be deplored, but congress meets in regular session in a few days and a compromise ought to be agreed upon at once. The president did the best he could at Paris, but he had to fight, single handed, against nations which were seeking to obtain advantages from the war. A perfect treaty could not be expected under such circumstances. The senate is a co-ordinate body under our constitution and has the last word in treaty making. More than three-fourths of the members of the senate—more than two-thirds of each party in the senate—favor the treaty and the League of Nations, but they differ in regard to proposed reservations. As neither side has a sufficient number of senators to act independently of the other, there must be a compromise or indefinite delay. If settlement is postponed until after the next election, the treaty cannot be ratified for at least sixteen months, and then neither party would be likely to control two-thirds of the senate.

"No party can afford to assume responsibility for what may happen in the meantime. The plutocrat and profiteer are abroad in the land and it is to their interest to make the treaty an issue in the next campaign, for then they will be able to secure a strangle hold upon the American people, while public attention is being given to foreign questions. But the masses are in no condition to bear greater burdens or to wait for relief. The antagonism between capital and labor increases and unrest grows while extortioners plunder all classes of society. It is time for the friends of the League of Nations to get together on a compromise so that our country may devote itself to pressing domestic problems."

THE ROLL OF HONOR

States That Have Ratified the National Woman Suffrage Amendment

- 1—WISCONSIN, June 10, 1919.
- 2—ILLINOIS, June 10, 1919.
- 3—MICHIGAN, June 10, 1919.
- 4—KANSAS, June 16, 1919.
- 6—NEW YORK, June 16, 1919.
- 7—PENNSYLVANIA, June 24, 1919.
- 8—MASSACHUSETTS, June 25, 1919.
- 9—TEXAS, June 28, 1919.
- 10—IOWA, July 2, 1919.
- 11—MISSOURI, July 3, 1919.
- 12—ARKANSAS, July 28, 1919.
- 13—MONTANA, July 30, 1919.
- 14—NEBRASKA, August 2, 1919.
- 15—MINNESOTA, Sept. 8, 1919.
- 16—NEW HAMPSHIRE, Sept. 10, 1919.
- 17—UTAH, Sept. 30, 1919.
- 18—CALIFORNIA, Nov. 1, 1919.
- 19—MAINE, Nov. 5, 1919.
- 20—NORTH DAKOTA, Dec. 1, 1919.
- 21—SOUTH DAKOTA, Dec. 3, 1919.
- 22—COLORADO, Dec. 12, 1919.

DEMAND ACTION ON PEACE TREATY

Settlement of differences over the peace treaty to permit its ratification as soon as possible after the senate reconvenes was urged in a statement issued at New York, November 23 by the League to Enforce Peace, at the conclusion of a special meeting of the executive committee.

Former President William H. Taft, president of the league, presided. Among others present were Oscar S. Straus and Herbert Hoover. The league's statement follows:

"The defeat of ratification has been received by the country with surprise and indignation. The people want peace. They want peace and they want a league of nations to guard the peace. Whose name it bears, which party brand it wears, they care not at all. They expected ratification before adjournment of the senate.

"The making of peace is no more a party question than was the making of war. The American people, without regard to party, stood behind the war until the day of victory. With like unanimity they now stand behind the treaty.

"Shall the small minority who oppose a league of nations in any form defeat ratification? Shall fifteen senators decide where America shall stand in this world crisis? Eighty senators have shown that they favor the principle of the league of nations. The fate of the treaty rests in their hands. They have the votes. They have the power. Theirs is the responsibility. They must get together.

"The failure to ratify the peace treaty has encouraged social unrest both at home and abroad.

"Men and women of America, this is your problem. Your interests, your welfare, the honor and the future of your country are involved. Your will is the supreme command.

"The league of nations gives the promise of a world co-operating for the purposes of peace and protecting itself by concerted action against war and the threat of war. The ideal is American. The men and women who gladly dedicated their sons and their substance to the cause of obtaining peace through the defeat of the German menace refuse to believe that they have made an empty sacrifice.

"They demand that the senators harmonize their differences. Refusal to do so will defy and betray the people of this country by whom they were elected and to whom they must answer."

CONGREGATIONALISTS AWAKE

On another page will be found the resolutions adopted by the congregationalists recently at their national meeting. They are awake to the seriousness of the conflict between capital and labor, and they are right in seeking reconciliation instead of urging a "fight to the finish."

THE OLD EXCUSE

The reason given for a failure to provide machinery for the prevention of strikes is the old familiar excuse given long ago for failure to repair a roof; viz., that it does not need it when the weather is good and that it can't be repaired when it is raining.

An Unfortunate Recommendation

In his recent message the President makes an unfortunate recommendation. In speaking of the income tax rate he says:

"The congress might well consider whether the higher rates of income and profits taxes can in peace times be effectively productive of revenue and whether they may not, on the contrary, be destructive of business activity and productive of waste and inefficiency. There is a point at which in peace times high rates of income and profits taxes discourage energy, remove the incentive to new enterprise, encourage extravagant expenditures and produce industrial stagnation with consequent unemployment and other attendant evils."

This is just what the republican leaders are sure to do. They will scale down the rates on large incomes first, leaving the people with smaller incomes to struggle along under their load. The tax as it now is does not relatively overburden those with large incomes; they can pay the high rates more easily than the people with smaller incomes can pay the lower rates.

The threat of the very rich to leave the country or to stop making money is not new. They said the same thing twenty-five years ago when the law provided for a flat rate of only two per cent.

The President has been misled by the sophistry always employed by those who try to shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor. The members and senators will find it difficult to defend before their constituents the income tax policy outlined by the President. And his position is even more indefensible on the subject of excess profits. If there is any tax that should not be lowered it is the excess profits tax. From present indications it may be the only means we shall have of reaching the profiteer. It is very unfortunate that the President should have made the recommendation that he did.

W. J. BRYAN.

THE ESCH BILL

Labor's protest against the Esch bill will be found on another page. It is worth reading. The railway employees have found out what the farmers have long known; namely, that the railway magnates demand CLASS GOVERNMENT—a government controlled by the railroads in the interest, not of the stockholders, but of the capitalists who grow rich by manipulating the railroads for their own pecuniary benefit. The capitalists expect the republican party to hold the public cow while the magnates do the milking. How long will the people stand it?

THE NEWSPAPER MONOPOLY

The Globe-Democrat, in defending its action in absorbing its only rival in the morning newspaper field, says:

Among cities of over 100,000 population in the United States forty-five have one morning paper and only nineteen have more than one. Of the nineteen cities, three, of course, are very much larger than St. Louis, and of the other sixteen only four others are above half a million population. The greater cities that have but one morning newspaper are St. Louis, Cleveland, Detroit, Denver, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Indianapolis, St. Paul, Portland, Ore.; Seattle, Milwaukee, Atlanta, Newark, Columbus, Toledo, Providence, Des Moines, Memphis, Dallas, Houston, Fort Worth, San Antonio, Syracuse and Spokane.

How many of these papers that have a monopoly of the morning field are reliable exponents of democracy as defined in the democratic platform and as illustrated by democratic reforms? Count them, and you will wonder how the democratic party survives. There is only one way to get the people's cause before the masses; namely, by means of a National Bulletin—not a NEWSPAPER, but a Bulletin—giving the issues and arguments on both sides. The private owned papers can furnish the NEWS, but information on public issues should come through public channels.

W. J. BRYAN.